

Reply to Office Action of October 10, 2008

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-10 are cancelled. Claims 11-15 are rejected. Claims 16-20 are allowed.

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,122,631 (Berbec).

Applicants have explained that

Referring now to Figure 6, a schematic diagram illustrating a read operation according to an embodiment of the present invention is shown. Client 52 requesting to read data from storage device 54 first sends the name of the requested file to name server 60, as indicated by 130. Name server 60 responds by sending the file identifier to client 52, indicated by the file handle in 132. Client 52 sends a location request to location server 66 which includes the file identifier, as indicated by 134. Location server 66 responds by sending client 52 locations for the file, as indicated by 136. Client 52 then performs one or more read operations by directly accessing storage device 54, as indicated by 138. Storage device 54 responds to each read request by providing data to client 52, as indicated by 140.

Application, p. 8, ll. 11-20.

With regard to claim 11, Berbec does not teach sending, by a client, the file name to a name server. Berbec's "client 102" does not send a file name to "server 106":

FIG. 2 shows the general procedure 200 for granting a token 120 to a client 102 seeking to access a file 110 stored in the file system 108. The procedure begins with a request 118 to the server 106 from the workstation client 102 (step 202). At this point, the server 106 has the file name, and the client 102 does not have the file name but expects to receive it in response to its request 118 to the server.

Berbec, col. 4, ll. 10-17 (emphasis added).

Reply to Office Action of October 10, 2008

With regard to claim 11, Berbec does not teach receiving, at the client and from the name server, a file identifier corresponding to the file name in response to sending the file name to the name server. As explained above, Berbec's "client 102" does not send a file name to "server 106." Berbec's "token 120," therefore, is not received in response to sending a file name to "server 106."

With regard to claim 11, Berbec does not teach receiving, at the client and from the location server, file location information identified by the location server and corresponding to the file identifier. The Examiner asserts that Berbec's "LAN server 104'" is the claimed location server. Office Action, October 10, 2008, p. 4. Berbec's "LAN server 104'," however, does not identify file location information corresponding to "token 120." Rather, Berbec's "LAN server 104'" merely relays access requests to "file system 108." See, Berbec, col. 6, ll. 35-43.

Claims 12-15 are patentable because they depend from claim 11.

Applicants' Attorney submits that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests a notice to that effect. Applicants' Attorney also invites a telephone conference if the Examiner believes that it will advance the prosecution of this application.

S/N: 09/373,795

Atty Dkt No. STK 98127 PUS

Reply to Office Action of October 10, 2008

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

**MARK A. BAKKE ET AL.**

By /Benjamin C. Stasa/

Benjamin C. Stasa

Reg. No. 55,644

Attorney for Applicants

Date: January 12, 2009

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor

Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400

Fax: 248-358-3351